REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated October 29, 2009. Claims 66 to 74 are pending in the application, of which Claims 66, 68, 70 and 72 to 74 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 66 and 71 were objected to for informalities. Without conceding the correctness of the objection, Applicants have amended Claims 66 and 71 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 66, 68 and 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,950,613 (Fujimoto) in view of U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0018226 (Yoshida). Claims 67, 69 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fujimoto and Yoshida in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,010 (Miyazaki). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns determining whether or not a present print setting is the same as a previous print setting obtained from a printer having that stores print settings and IDs of printer drivers that have given the printer print instructions. By using this information obtained from the printer, an apparatus may give a user a warning when the print settings used by the user at a previous time and the present time are different from each other. In addition, if there are different users, no warning is issued because the print setting may be changed by every user. By virtue of this arrangement, a warning is issued only when the warning is necessary. Accordingly, both the wastage of paper and the issuance of unnecessary warnings can be minimized.

Claims 66, 68 and 70

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 66 is directed to an information processing apparatus connected with a printer via an interface, wherein the printer has no sensor for sensing a print setting, receives print data and an ID of a printer driver sent from the information processing apparatus, and has a storage unit for storing print settings contained in the received print data and a printing unit for performing printing based on the received print data. The information processing apparatus includes a first obtaining unit, configured to obtain from the storage unit of the printer an ID of a printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a previous time; a first determination unit, configured to determine whether or not the ID of the printer driver obtained from the storage unit and the ID of the printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a present time to determine whether or not a present user who gives a print instruction to a printer at the present time is the same as the previous user at the previous time; a second obtaining unit, configured to obtain a previous print setting used by the present user at a pervious time from the storage unit of the printer when it is determined by the first determination unit that the present user is not the same as the previous user; a second determination unit, configured to determine whether or not a present print setting set at the present time is the same as the previous print setting obtained from the storage unit of the printer by second obtaining unit; a warning unit, configured to warn when it is determined by the second determination unit that the present print setting is not the same as the previous print setting; and a transmission unit, configured to transmit print data to the printer either when it is determined by the second determination unit that the present print

setting is the same as the previous print setting or when it is determined by the first determination unit that the present user is the same as the previous user.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Fujimoto and Yoshida, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the apparatus of Claim 66. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of obtaining from a storage unit of a printer an ID of a printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a previous time, determining whether or not the ID of the printer driver obtained from the storage unit and the ID of the printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a present time of determining whether or not a present user who gives a print instruction to a printer at the present time is the same as the previous user at the previous time, obtaining a previous print setting used by the present user at the previous time from the storage unit of the printer when it is determined in said first determination step that the present user is not the same as the previous user and determining whether or not a present print setting set at the present time is the same as the previous print setting obtained from the storage unit of the printer.

In contrast to the present invention, Fujimoto discloses an office information system having an operational history storage device 27B that stores an operational behavior of a number of users. The operational history is used to generate a customized message for different users when the different users are detected. (See Fujimoto, column 14, lines 34 to 46.)

Furthermore, Yoshida discloses an image forming apparatus connected to a network. The image forming apparatus displays an instruction for a user to set a desired

paper on a manual paper supply port when a manual paper supply mode was selected at a previous time after a new job has begun. The instruction is displayed because a subsequent user will probably use a different type of paper than a previous user. (See Yoshida, paragraph [0050].)

However, neither Fujimoto nor Yoshida disclose or suggest obtaining from a storage unit of a printer an ID of a printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a previous time nor do they suggest obtaining a previous print setting used by the present user at the previous time from the storage unit of the printer when it is determined in said first determination step that the present user is not the same as the previous user. In addition, neither reference discloses a printer that lacks a sensor for sensing a print setting, receives print data and an ID of a printer driver sent from the information processing apparatus, and has a storage unit for storing print settings contained in the received print data and a printing unit for performing printing based on the received print data as featured in Claim 66.

By virtue of these features that are not found in the cited art, the information processing apparatus of Claim 66 may give a user a warning informing the user that print settings used by the user at a previous time and the present time are different in a case where the print settings are determined to be different from each other. Therefore, a warning is issued only when a warning is necessary. Accordingly, both the wasting of paper and unnecessary warnings are avoided.

In light of the deficiencies of Fujimoto and Yoshida as discussed above, Applicants submit that independent Claim 66 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Independent Claims 68 and 70 are directed to a method and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 66. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 68 and 70 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Claims 72 to 74

Representative Claim 73 is directed to a method for an information processing apparatus connected with a printer via an interface, wherein the printer has no sensor for sensing a print setting, receives print data and an ID of a printer driver sent from the information processing apparatus, and has a storage unit for storing print settings contained in the received print data and a printing unit for performing printing based on the received print data. The method comprises a first obtaining step of obtaining from the storage unit of the printer an ID of a printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a previous time; a first determining step of determining whether or not the ID of printer driver obtained from the storage unit and the ID of the printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a present time to determine whether or not a present user who gives a print instruction to a printer at the present time is the same as the previous user at the previous time; a second obtaining step of obtaining a previous print setting used by the present user at the previous time from the storage unit of the printer; a second determining step of determining whether or not a present print setting set at the present time is the same as the previous print setting obtained from the storage unit of the printer by said second obtaining unit; a warning step of warning when it is determined in said first determining step that the present user is the same as the previous user and it is

determined in said second determining step that the present print setting is not the same as the previous print setting; and a transmitting step of transmitting print data to the printer either when it is determined in said second determining step that the present print setting is the same as the previous print setting or when it is determined in said first determining step that the present user is the same as the previous user.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Fujimoto and Yoshida, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the apparatus of Claim 73. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of obtaining from the storage unit of the printer an ID of a printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a previous time, determining whether or not the ID of printer driver obtained from the storage unit and the ID of the printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a present time to determine whether or not a present user who gives a print instruction to a printer at the present time is the same as the previous user at the previous time, obtaining a previous print setting used by the present user at the previous time from the storage unit of the printer, determining whether or not a present print setting set at the present time is the same as the previous print setting obtained from the storage unit of the printer, warning when it is determined that the present user is the same as the previous user and it is determined that the present print setting is not the same as the previous print setting and transmitting print data to the printer either when it is determined that the present print setting is the same as the previous print setting or when it is determined that the present user is the same as the previous user.

As discussed above, neither Fujimoto nor Yoshida disclose or suggest obtaining from a storage unit of a printer an ID of a printer driver that has given the printer a print instruction at a previous time nor do they suggest obtaining a previous print setting used by the present user at the previous time from the storage unit of the printer when it is determined in said first determination step that the present user is not the same as the previous user. In addition, neither reference discloses a printer that lacks a sensor for sensing a print setting, receives print data and an ID of a printer driver sent from the information processing apparatus, and has a storage unit for storing print settings contained in the received print data and a printing unit for performing printing based on the received print data. In addition, Claim 73 includes the additional feature of warning when it is determined that the present user is the same as the previous user and it is determined that the present print setting is not the same as the previous print setting. Such a feature is not found in either Fujimoto or Yoshida.

In light of the deficiencies of Fujimoto and Yoshida as discussed above, Applicants submit that independent Claim 73 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Independent Claims 72 and 74 are directed to an apparatus and a computer-readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 73. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 72 and 74 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect

of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each dependent claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due. However, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2799958v1